

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-13, and 15-33 were pending as of the action with a notification date of November 26, 2008. Claims 1, 8, 13, 19, 24, and 29 are in independent form.

Claims 1, 4-13, and 5-33 are amended. New claims 34-35, corresponding to claim 2, are being submitted. No new matter is added as a result of these amendments. Reconsideration of the action is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks Examiner Tank for discussing the action in a telephone interview with the applicant's representatives on February 25, 2009. Applicants discussed the amendments to claim 1 with Examiner Tank. Examiner Tank indicated that the amendments to claim 1 and similar amendments to claim 8 would likely overcome the Section 103 rejections; however, a further search might be necessary.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-13 and 15-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Microsoft Excel 2000, copyright 1999 Microsoft Corporation, as evidenced by Blattner, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Excel 2000", published by Que Corporation 1999 ("Blattner"), and Bott, "Special Edition Using Microsoft Office 2000", published by Que Corporation 1999 ("Bott"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,757,371 ("Oran").

Claim 1, as amended recites calculating an adapted presentation of the destination toolbar with a moved button, such that the destination toolbar constraints and the presentation sizes specified by the button constraints determine the size of the moved button in the destination toolbar.

The Office stated that Oran discloses determining the size of the moved button.

The cited portions of Oran disclose a task bar that displays buttons corresponding to applications running on a user's computer. As the Office noted, when buttons are added to the

taskbar, all of the buttons are redrawn to a new size that is based on the available area of the taskbar and the number of buttons (Oran, column 7, lines 5-19). However, the cited portions of Oran do not disclose or suggest determining the size of the moved button in the destination toolbar from the destination toolbar constraints and the presentation sizes specified by the button constraints. Rather, Oran determines the button size based only on the number of buttons and the available area. Blattner and Bott do not provide what Oran lacks.

In addition, claim 1 recites a set of toolbar constraints, the toolbar constraints specifying a range of toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation, where the toolbar constraints include constraints derived from the set of destination toolbar buttons. This limitation was originally in claim 4.

In reference to claim 4, the Office stated that Blattner discloses toolbar constraints at page 869, quoting "Excel enables you to add and remove buttons on any of the default toolbars."

The cited portion of Blattner discloses adding and removing buttons to a toolbar. However, the cited portions of Blattner do not disclose or suggest determining constraints specifying the height or width of the toolbar from the toolbar buttons. Specifically, Blattner does not disclose or suggest a set of toolbar constraints, the toolbar constraints specifying a range of toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation, where the toolbar constraints include constraints derived from the set of destination toolbar buttons, as recited in claim 1. Oran and Bott do not provide what Blattner lacks.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2, 4, and 7, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 13 and 24, as well as claims 15-18, which depend from claim 13, and claims 25-28, which depend from claim 24 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Claim 8, as amended, recites calculating an adapted presentation of the destination band with the one or more source toolbar buttons, such that the destination toolbar constraints and the presentation sizes specified by the respective button constraints determine the size of the source toolbar buttons.

The Office stated that Oran discloses determining the size of the source toolbar buttons.

As described above in reference to claim 1, Oran discloses adding buttons to a taskbar and redrawing all of the buttons to a new size that is based on the available area of the taskbar and the number of buttons. However, the cited portions of Oran do not disclose or suggest determining the size of the moved button from the destination toolbar constraints and the presentation sizes specified by the button constraints.

In addition, claim 8 recites a set of destination toolbar constraints, the destination toolbar constraints specifying a range of destination toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of destination toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation, where the destination toolbar constraints include constraints derived from the set of destination toolbar buttons. This limitation was originally in claim 9.

In reference to claim 9, the Office stated that Blattner discloses toolbar constraints at page 869. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

As discussed above in reference to claim 1, the cited portion of Blattner only discloses adding and removing buttons to a toolbar and does not disclose or suggest a set of destination toolbar constraints, the destination toolbar constraints specifying a range of destination toolbar heights for a horizontal toolbar presentation and a range of destination toolbar widths for a vertical toolbar presentation, where the destination toolbar constraints include constraints derived from the set of destination toolbar buttons, as recited in claim 8.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 8, as well as claims 9-12, which depend from claim 8, are in condition for allowance for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 19 and 29, as well as claims 20-23, which depend from claim 19, and claims 30-33, which depend from claim 29 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

New Claims

New claims 34 and 35 depend from claims 13 and 24 respectively. The applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons their respective parent claims are allowable.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the Office, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of the claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the Office with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 26, 2009

/Elspeth S. White/
Elspeth S. White
Reg. No. 62,133

Customer No. 1876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945